DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 023 705 TE 500 238

By - Shugrue, Michael F.

The Role of the Junior College Instructor in the Development of Relevant Graduate Programs in English.

Pub Date 19 Oct 68

Note - 7p.; Address to the Florida College English Association, Fort Myers, Florida, October 19, 1968.

EDRS Price MF - $0.25 HC - $0.45

Descriptors - Academic Enrichment, Administrative Personnel, Administrator Role, Articulation (Program), *College Teachers, Degrees (Titles), Educational Trends, *English Instruction, *Higher Education, Inservice Programs, *Junior Colleges, *Program Improvement, Teacher Education

Identifiers - MLA, Modern Language Association

Introductory remarks discuss the commitments which the Modern Language Association (MLA) has made toward improving the teaching of English and indicate the Association's willingness to bring the junior college teacher and four-year college teacher into a continuing, mutually instructive dialogue which will produce improved college English teaching at all levels. Statistics are quoted indicating the seriousness of the state of English in higher education. The major portion of the speech identifies and discusses five important areas which the emergence of the junior college forces the MLA to examine: (1) the development of new and modified degree programs, (2) the establishment of "solid, useful, intellectually challenging" in-service programs on the junior college campuses, (3) the thoughtful consideration of the use of students and non-academics as assistants and para-professionals in the junior college, (4) the development of the junior college chairman as the cornerstone of any effective English program, and (5) a careful re-examination of what is taught in any college classroom and how it is taught. (BN)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

The Role of the Junior College English Instructor in the Development of Relevant Graduate Programs in English

By: Michael F. Shugrue

The current attempt to study the preparation of teachers of English for the junior colleges is the fourth study of teacher preparation in which the Modern Language Association has participated. While Don Cameron Allen's witty and brilliantly written The Ph.D. in English and American Literature (Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967) is the most distinguished report of these studies yet to appear, we can point with some pride to the Guidelines prepared during the English Teacher Preparation Study (English Journal, April 1968), and to the recommendations on graduate programs in English education, developed by Dwight Burton of Florida State University, which will be published early in 1969.

For more than eighty years the MLA has been associated with scholarly research and publication, but that traditional and well-conceived interest has masked the commitment to the teaching of English which has been a major concern of the association from its earliest days. At the first convention of the MLA in 1884, for example, ten of the fourteen papers dealt with teaching problems. Of the seventeen articles in the first volume of PMLA, ten are concerned with the curriculum and with methods of teaching. In the 1950's, before Sputnik I made education a public concern, George Winchester Stone, then Executive Secretary of the MLA, helped to raise the Ford Foundation money which made possible The Basic Issues Conferences of 1958, the real spark for the curriculum revolution of the 1960's. In the ten years since 1958, the MLA has worked particularly closely with the National Council of Teachers of English on literally dozens of projects designed to improve the teaching of English: Thomas Wilcox's Survey of Undergraduate English Programs (to be published in 1969), the English Institute Materials Center (1965-1967), and the evaluation of NDEA Institutes, to name only three. Moreover, it provided the leadership (and the financial support) for the establishment of the now flourishing Association of Departments of English, the Vacancy Lists of faculty positions available in American colleges, the ADE seminars for New Chairmen (to be held at the University of New Mexico in June of 1969), and for cooperative efforts with the American Center of P.E.N. to bring more creative writers into college departments of English.

Yet PMLA began to list the chairmen of junior and community colleges in its directory issue only two years ago and the MLA annual meeting included a special conference on the problems of the junior college for the first time in 1967. The current study of the preparation of teachers of English for the junior college, funded by the Carnegie Corporation of New York, gives the MLA its first, major opportunity to involve junior college teachers of English in the activities, publications, and policy-making of the association. We welcome that opportunity and hope that the contributions of the specialist in junior college teaching and curriculum development will become as important a source of vitality for the MLA as those of such distinguished scholars as Maynard Mack, Wayne Booth, and Northrop Frye. It was Frye, by the way, who urged the MLA in 1964 to help change the elementary curriculum.

ED023705
TE 500 238

My being with the Florida College English Association today is an indication of the willingness of the MLA to seek the counsel of the junior college community and to work to bring the junior college English teacher and the graduate professor into a continuing dialogue which will produce not only programs uniquely appropriate for the special problems of the junior college--vocational students, adolescents not yet sure what higher education can or should mean to them, students unable to read at a secondary much less a so-called "college level"--but programs which will help American higher education improve the college teaching of English in every kind of college and university, in every class from freshman composition to the seminar in BEOWULF. The graduate departments will be unable to effect that transformation alone, but there is a clear willingness in graduate departments to seek assistance and to innovate, in part because graduate education is finding it ever more difficult to justify, to society and to the American taxpayer, scholarly concerns divorced from the social and educational revolution now taking place in our country. It is not comfortable for scholars to inhabit universities described by Charles Muscatine of Berkeley as "terrible in their neglect of what we know about human growth and development" or to be members of faculties about which he can write, "Ninety per cent of what is wrong with the modern American university is the responsibility not of the administration but of the faculty." And the graduate professor must blush when Donald O'Dowd asks how a major social institution can care so little about understanding its central function of teaching. It is ironic, I think, to consider the implications of these quotations. We are often accustomed to think that the university graduate departments must come to the aid of the beleaguered junior college. I am suggesting that the dedicated junior college teacher must come to the aid of the university department if it is to find relevance and to serve society as well as its discipline. I very much like the notion that each can contribute to the other; I like the two-way street much better than the one-way street.

Professor Don Allen has demonstrated beyond doubt that the graduate departments are not producing a sufficient number of Ph.D's for the 2164 colleges and universities in the United States, that a system which produces only about 550 Ph.D's a year requires nearly eleven years on the way to the degree, that 40% of those trained in research-oriented programs publish no research, that nearly one-third of all those who received the degree between 1955 and 1965 went out into teaching-- their life's work with no teaching experience of any kind, that 40% of the graduate departments admit that they do nothing to help doctoral candidates learn about their college and junior college duties. The Wilcox report will reveal that while 77.8% of the four-year institutions in the United States participate in the preparation of school teachers, some 56% report that they do not "regularly confer with or offer aid to" the secondary schools for which most of their teachers are being trained, that despite the almost universal requirement for American literature in the eleventh grade, only 61% of the colleges require it of their majors and teaching majors, that while school faculties wrestle with hard decisions about changing language programs, only 39% of the colleges require linguistics and only 29% require advanced composition.

Allow me to recite just a few more statistics about the state of English in higher education. We currently believe that the United States will need 1800 new junior college teachers a year for the next decade, a full 37% of all the MA's produced in the country. Our four-year colleges need 39%. Our total need for MA's--and we would hope these were better prepared as prospective teachers as well as students of literature than many now are--is some 336% of the annual supply, even if one includes the 53 new programs being started in the United States. But I shall cease my grim recital of our problems without more than passing reference to the fact that more than one fifth of the four-year colleges still have a fifteen-hour

teaching load and that it is almost universal in the junior college, that classrooms are too crowded, that most colleges seem incredibly naive about the uses of technology and media, that the censorship of books at all levels of education--including the college--is rampant--and try to suggest how we at the MLA are trying to solve or at least look for solutions for some of these problems.

In addition to spreading statistical gloom, I can identify five major areas which the emergence of the junior college English program forces us to examine: 1) the development of new and modified degree programs through existing and soon-to-be established graduate programs; 2) the establishment of solid, useful, intellectually challenging in-service programs on junior college campuses, programs which feature the exchange of faculty between two and four-year institutions, close cooperation on the part of the administration, reduced teaching loads, and the opportunity for experimentation on the junior college campus; 3) thoughtful consideration of the use of students and non-academics as assistants and paraprofessionals on the junior college campus as a way of handling large numbers of students effectively while allowing the trained professional to keep pace with his own discipline, with relevant studies in other disciplines, and with advances in technology, media, and pedagogy; 4) the development of the junior college chairman as the cornerstone of any effective English program, as the key to the development of a qualified faculty, and as the knowledgeable source for information about federal and foundation support for faculty and for curriculum experimentation; and,5) finally, the careful re-examination of what we teach in any college classroom and of how we teach it.

Let me comment on each of these vital areas of interest to the university community and to the faculty on the two and four-year college.

Although Derek Singer of the American Association of Junior Colleges has noted that more than seventy institutions now offer programs designed to prepare junior college teachers, I am hard-pressed to identify many which have really approached the problem of educating junior college teachers of English successfully. I can point to existing programs at Carnegie-Mellon, Iowa, Nebraska, and Tennessee, and I can praise proposals for programs at Illinois and at Oregon, but I am convinced that most of the approximately 400 departments in the United States offering graduate work in English have not yet acknowledged the need to re-structure their graduate programs. The MLA recommendations concerning the Ph.D. did, indeed, lead at least eleven departments to re-vamp doctoral work in 1967, to speed up the process of becoming a college teacher of English without losing the training in the discipline of English and in pedagogy which must be part of any successful program. I can hope that many more institutions which have been studying their doctoral programs since the publication of the recommendations and of the Allen report will soon follow the steps taken by such universities as Indiana, Yale, Johns Hopkins, and New Mexico. But I wonder, even within this noticeable reform movement, how often junior college teachers have been consulted about the directions which program changes should take. I cannot believe that any graduate department will re-define the goals of graduate study in English successfully unless it recognizes that the junior college faculty member, engaging a larger percentage of those who begin higher education each year, must participate in the decision-making about graduate work. The junior college teacher, aware of the language problems of students in a way that the university professor is not, knows the importance of a balanced program; one which includes work in linguistics, study in such related disciplines as psychology, sociology, and speech, as well in literature; one which brings the prospective college

teacher into contact with students like those whom he will teach early in his graduate program in situations both formal and informal; one which recognizes the contributions of pedagogy to the effectiveness of any teacher in any classroom. I would hope that in this year of meetings and conferences the MLA can stimulate graduate professors and junior college teachers to talk to one another about their needs so that junior college teachers can influence the direction of graduate programs more directly by convincing graduate faculty memebers that they have a momentous stake in the education of junior college teachers of English.

While a single three-hour course in anthropology at the graduate level will probably not serve the future college teacher well, it is equally clear that he cannot teach successfully in a junior college unless he knows something about the matter with which anthropology deals and can relate that knowledge to his knowledge of language growth and behavior. To design satisfactory programs will take time, the break-down of barriers on both sides, and funds to experiment both on the junior college campus and on the university campus. Thus far, few college departments of English have even requested funds for the development of programs authorized by the Education Professions Development Act.

Two barriers have most often blocked effective communication: terminology and suspicion. Terminology is as difficult to deal with as suspicion, but I shall say a few words about it first. Our profession, Doctor-Mad as it is, cannot decide what to call the man dedicated to Teaching in a college. Shall he be called an AbD, an M.Phil., Doctor of Arts, Doctor of English, or C.Phil.? The question of a degree which will give status to the man who earns it without relegating him to a lower rung on the academic ladder plagues us. I would argue that the name of the degree means so little that we should not allow debate about new kinds of doctorates to inhibit a real discussion about the substance of new programs. Let the Ph.D, especially the D. part of it, remain the badge of the research scholar; but let us teach the academic world to recognize and to reward the specialist in teaching on a junior college campus or in the university on an equal basis; let him have the same measure of dignity by virtue of his specialty that the medievalist or the student of the eighteenth century novel now holds. To accomplish this change requires first that the graduate professor learn to understand the nature of the junior college specialization, but it also demands that the junior college teacher cease hungering after phantom glories which have little to do with his work.

Suspicion is intricately interwoven with the problem of terminology. Because the graduate professor knows little about the junior college, because he suspects that its faculty has simply moved up from the secondary school in order to teach less and earn more, because he feels that the student who enters a junior college is intellectually (perhaps even emotionally and morally) inferior to the university freshman, he often has a condescending attitude toward junior college English, one based on methods of inquiry which would shock him if they were employed by any collegue in his special academic field. He knows little about the development of the junior college movement in the United States and has probably had little contact with junior college faculty and none with any but transfer students. But he is educable and the effort, therefore, is worthwhile because it will hasten change in graduate education. On the other hand, when the junior college instructor, with the limited experience of graduate school, catergorizes the university scholar as pedantic, ineffective as a teacher, isolated from social and educational change, he turns away from his disciplinary home in disgust. He, too, must learn that there is good-will and dedication to be found among professors and begin to communicate the junior college world he knows to his colleagues in university departments.

Yet while barriers are being broken down and new programs established, the shortage of qualified staff members for junior college English departments continues. With more than sixty new colleges opening each year and with enrollments growing at a staggering rate, the chairman in all but a few junior colleges, which are privileged by location or reputation, must search long and hard to find qualified staff to meet classes. When staff comes from the secondary schools, he must question the quality of their preparation, keeping in mind the NCTE statistics which revealed as late as 1964 that nearly half of the secondary school teachers of English in the United States lacked an English major and James R. Squire's 1967 report that most classrooms in the best secondary schools in the country were still, in his words, "teacher-dominated" and "stress 'passive' and apparently deductive learning." If these new staff members are recruited from the graduate schools, he must ask whether they know anything at all about the teaching of reading, linguistics, and pedagogy--all essentials to good junior college teaching--and whether they have ever faced a classroom. I think we must finally conclude that while the junior colleges will annually attract many qualified teachers, they will still need to offer intensive in-service programs in order to up-grade the quality of their staffs. Given heavy teaching loads and large classes, time and energy for such in-service work is limited; given the limited interest on the part of junior colleges thus far in securing the funds available for such work under section E of EPDA, funds have been slow in coming to junior colleges for such work; given the reluctance of many administrations to make such study possible, in-service growth has been largely individual and fragmented. I would suggest that the department, through its chairman particularly, must find the time to develop professionally <u>as a faculty</u>, as well as individually. Because the phrase "in-service work" carries bad connotations at the college level, let us, if we will, rather talk about continuing seminars on the problems of the content of English courses and of the methodology for reaching and motivating students successfully. I see such programs as opportunities for junior college departments to use the expertise of university specialists and at the same time to introduce them to the junior college movement. Even if they are brought in under the guise of lecturers, they must be brought to campus to become involved in the work of the junior college. Funds for travel to professional meetings, sabbaticals, and assistance for research into the teaching of English are at least as essential on the junior college campus as they are at the university.

The secondary schools in the United States have not yet broken the teach-all-day syndrome and the quality of their faculty, given all the good will in the world and all the snatches of reading and trying to keep up on the part of good teachers, betrays it. The junior college is a <u>college</u>, albeit a special kind of college which embraces segments of the population never before brought into higher education, and a college must be a place which offers both students and faculty the time to think, to use acquired skills to investigate, to gain new competence. I recognize that the junior college is sometimes thought of as an extension of high school and I reject that notion entirely, even for programs for the so-called vocational or terminal student. Somehow, this student particularly must be made aware, no matter what he is engaged in doing, that his opportunities in a junior college are quite different from those he enjoyed in secondary schools, that there is a freedom to make decisions--even bad ones--which distinguishes the college from his previous educational experience. And if the student must be

given these opportunities, so, obviously, must the faculty member. Indeed, the right of the junior college English instructor to play a leading role in the English profession and to participate in the development of new graduate programs depends, in large part, on his having time to read, to study, to confer, and, if he chooses, to write.

If teachers are to remain i. short supply and if those who are successfully engaged in teaching on the junior college campus are to grow professionally, the need for assistance for the professional teacher of English becomes more imperative each year. I hope that more junior colleges can experiment, as such outstanding ones as Diablo Valley in California have, with the use of para-professionals, often the students themselves,used not merely to grade papers routinely or to mark quizzes, but to engage fellow students, to help motivate them, to help them learn and in so doing to help themselves to mature and to learn. If the college is to be a community, the students must be given a share of that community, a task particularly difficult in a commuting school. Pep clubs, teams, school colors, and even students on curriculum committees are not the real answers to the involvement of students in the life of the college. Finding ways to dim the lines separating teacher and student and to engage students in helping to educate one another may be.

As the size of junior college departments of English increases and the number of programs which it offers multiplies, the chairmanship becomes increasingly crucial to the success of the department. While I understand the suspicion of "professional administrators" common to many two and four-year faculties, I do believe, as John Gerber of Iowa, Robert Rogers of Illinois,and John Fisher of the MLA have eloquently noted, that the day of the amateur chairman is over. The business of running a department--budget, staffing, in-fighting with the administration, curriculum development--grows more complex every fall. The junior college faculty, drawing upon the facilities of the Association of Departments of English whenever it can, must strengthen the departmental chairmanship, now often a relatively meaningless and powerless office, and the chairman must develop future administrators for his department through the effective use of committees and the careful delegation of his power. Each year in the United States more than 300 new English chairmen assume office; some take their turns because the department wishes to show off its distinguished scholars--it does so at its peril in a competitive hiring situation--; some others muddle through a one or two-year rotation which eventually brings the title to every man in the department. In junior colleges the chairmanship probably rotates too frequently, in part to allay the suspicions of the faculty about empire building. The consequence, of course, is that the man in office seldom has the opportunity to learn to do his job creatively. Although he knows how to get the daily work done, he is unable to help the department make long-range plans for the improvement of either faculty or programs. Because the chairman is key to his department and college, he will be asked to represent the junior college in the regional and national dialogue which will change graduate education in English. His experience and the suppprt of his department and administration must have prepared him to do so.

Finally, all of us as college teachers of English must know more about the subject which w teach. The subject or discipline called English resists easy categorization. The great curriculum movement of the 1960's, most closely identified with the curriculum study centers established by project English or the English program of the USOE, has significantly changed English instruction in the schools. While I can point to

studies and wide experimentation in higher education, I think that it is now time to launch a second project English directed at the college curriculum. I earnestly hope that the junior college community will provide the leadership for this second drive to improve the teaching of English.

Despite the number and complexity of problems facing higher education, we at the MLA, working with the NCTE and with the AAJC, are beginning a year-long look at English teachers and at the teaching of English in the junior college. The results of questionnaires mailed to each of the 843 chairmen of junior college English departments and to approximately 14,000 junior college English teachers will enable us to provide an authoritative portrait of the junior college teacher of English and of the department in which he teaches. Five regional conferences and the advice of a board of scholars and teachers from two and four-year institutions will help us to make recommendations for attracting young men and women into junior college teaching, for designing relevant graduate programs to prepare junior college English teachers, and for instituting in-service programs which will improve the professional qualifications of junior college teachers. But our study is only the first part of a two-part program. The second part must take place on your campuses, in graduate departments and in the junior college, as recommendations are examined, proposals written, and new programs begun. We ask your help this year. We offer ours in the years ahead.

Address to the Florida College English Association, Fort Myers, Florida, October 19, 1968